The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., DECEMBER 1, 1904. NO. 46.

THE DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL FUND AND THE CONSTITUTION.

THE "Catholic News Agency" of Washington, D. C., has sent out the following letter to its customers:

Whenever the proposition is made that Catholic parochial schools should have a proportionate share of the public funds, it is quite customary to have the Constitution of the United States quoted in opposition.

I maintained some time ago in one of my letters that a recent decision of the Supreme Court was, at least by inference, capable of being construed as being favorable to the Catholic contention. Mr. Preuss, in a succeeding issue of THE REVIEW, confessed a curiosity to know more regarding this decision of the Supreme Court. Before satisfying this craving for information I shall quote other instances in the history of kindred legislation, to show that the separation of Church and State was never considered to be threatened by them.

There have been times when Congress was in a mood to be liberal. For instance, in 1832, an act was passed and approved, giving Columbia College, a Baptist institution, lands of the value of $25,000; and in 1833 a similar grant was made to Georgetown College, a Catholic school in charge of the Jesuits.

Congress has always provided chaplains for each House and for the Army and Navy. The prayers in Congress are nearly always concluded with the words: "For Christ's sake, Amen," a distinct recognition of Christianity. Then again Congress has frequently made appropriations for religious and charitable institutions in the District of Columbia, in the very face of its declared policy not to make such appropriations. All of which goes to show that this great question resolves itself into a matter of politics and policy.

The case which elicited a decision of the Supreme Court was the act of Congress authorizing two isolating buildings on the

grounds of two hospitals. The selection of the hospitals was left to the discretion of the District Commissioners. Under that authority, the Commissioners made an agreement with Providence Hospital, which is a private hospital in charge of, and owned by, the Sisters of the Roman Catholic Church, for the construction of an isolating building on the hospital grounds, and for the receipt therein of poor patients sent there by the Commissioners, and for payments by the District on that account to the hospital. A citizen of Washington applied to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for an injunction prohibiting the Treasurer of the United States from paying out any money in pursuance of the contract, on the ground that it was a violation of both of the statutes in question and of the first amendment, and an injunction was accordingly granted by Justice Hagner. From the decree of Justice Hagner an appeal was taken to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. That Court on April 4th, 1898, reversed the decree of the court below, and the complainant thereupon appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, on Dec. 4th, 1899, sustained the decree of the Court of Appeals.

Thus it will be seen that in 1897 Congress made the same provision respecting hospitals conducted by religious societies which it made respecting schools similarly conducted, declaring it the settled policy of the government to make no appropriations of money or property for the support of any sectarian school, or other institution under sectarian control, and that this declaration has been declared inoperative by the Supreme Court of the United States. The text of the decision in regard to this particular point is as follows:

"If such an association may be lawfully incorporated, why may not Providence Hospital, though, as alleged, owned and conducted by a monastic order or sisterhood of the Roman Catholic Church, contract with the duly authorized agents of the government, to receive, not a subsidy or gift of money, but compensation for actual services to be rendered."

On page 467, the court says:

"Without assuming to express an opinion of the scope of the prohibitory words of the Constitution, we suggest that it seems to be the opinion of learned commentators of very high authority that the declaration was intended to secure nothing more than complete religious liberty to all persons and the absolute separation of the Church from the State, by the prohibition of any preference by law in favor of any one religious persuasion, or mode of worship."

Conclusion of the court:

"Held that the agreement was one which it was within the power of the Commissioners to make; and that it did not conflict with the provisions in Article 1 of the Amendments to the Constitution that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

It is the opinion of an eminent lawyer, whom I consulted on the subject, that in view of these practices on the part of Congress and the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, there is no constitutional inhibition to the making of contracts, on the part of a State, with the Catholic parochial schools, or any

other private schools, for the education of children for which the public schools make no provision, either for want of proper accommodations, or for other equally valid reasons.

E. L. SCHARF, PH. D.

* * *

Apart from the prohibition against requiring any religious test as a qualification for holding office, the Constitution of the United States does not deal with the question of religion otherwise than by the First Amendment, which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establisment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." "Thus," says Judge Story in his Commentaries on the Constitution, "the whole power over the subject of religion was left exclusively to the State governments to be acted on according to their own sense of justice and the State constitutions."

To cater (we can use no other word) to the then growing anti-Catholic sentiment, which had received so much encouragement during the presidency of General Grant, James G. Blaine, on December 14th, 1875, in the House of Representatives, proposed an amendment to the above quoted article of the Constitution in the following words: "No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by school taxation in any State for the support of public schools or derived from any public fund therefor, nor any public lands devoted thereto shall ever be under the control of any religious sect; nor shall any money so raised or land so devoted be divided between religious sects or denominations."

At their next national conventions both the Democratic and Republican parties inserted a declaration in their platforms approving the proposed amendment. In the House the amendment was adopted by nearly a unanimous vote, but it failed to secure sufficient votes in the Senate, and in consequence was never submitted to the people. Since then neither of the political parties has deemed it expedient to revive the subject, although various "American Alliances" and similar associations have from time to time passed resolutions urging Congress to submit the amendment to the popular vote.

As a result, that original amendment forbidding Congress to pass any law for "an establishment of religion," is the only restraint contained in the Federal Constitution, and this has remained unaltered in text since its enactment more than one hundred years ago.

The Providence Hospital case referred to by Dr. Scharf is the same case recorded in the law reports under the title of Bradfield vs. Roberts. It arose in the District of Columbia. This District

has no separate constitution, as have the individual States. Moreover its sole law-making power is the Congress of the United States, limited only by the provisions of the Federal Constitution. Providence Hospital was the corporate title of an institution which had been incorporated by Act of Congress, passed August 7th, 1864, at a time when our country was in the throes of civil war and hospital service was in greatest need. From its foundation the hospital had been in charge of the Sisters of Charity, of Emmitsburg we believe, but there was nothing in its charter or in its system of management to distinguish it before the law from any other duly incorporated body. Its professed object and purpose was the relief of sick and suffering humanity, and the teaching of religion was no part of the business which the government had authorized it to do. The distinction between such a case and that of a parochial school must, of course, be manifest to our readers.

When the appropriation was made by Congress in March, 1897, for the erection of an isolation building to which the poor were to be admitted, Bradfield, a tax-payer, sought to restrain the Treasurer of the United States, Roberts, from making payment, on the ground that the appropriation was in contravention of the First Amendment of the Federal Constitution.

In its account of the decision of that case by the Supreme Court of the United States, Dr. Scharf's paper leads us to believe that the quotations which he gives have been taken from the opinion of the United States Supreme Court. But in this we think he is in error. His quotations are from the decision of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and while the result reached on the appeal to the Supreme Court was an affirmance of the decision of the lower court, yet the grounds of opinion stated by the Supreme Court are not those given in Dr. Scharf's letter. The opinion of the Supreme Court, delivered by Judge Peckham, may be found in the Supreme Court Reports, Volume 175, page 291, and we think that the perusal of it will show that the main question raised, namely, whether the apppropriation was or was not contrary to the Federal Constitution, was not decided by that Court on the grounds assigned by Dr. Scharf; for we find the opinion saying (p. 296): "If we were to assume for the purpose of this question that under this appropriation an agreement with a religious corporation of the tenor of this agreement would be invalid as resulting indirectly in the passage of an act respecting an establishment of religion, we are unable to see that the complainant in his bill shows that the corporation is of the kind described, but on the contrary he has clearly shown that it is not."

In other words, the Court decided that it was immaterial whether the managers of the hospital were Catholics or Methodists, Bap-

tists or Unitarians, and that the purposes of the hospital corporation could be accomplished independently of any question of religion.

There was no act of Congress forbidding the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to contract with the Providence Hospital as a purely secular corporation for the care of sick and helpless citizens, and consequently the decision of the Supreme Court determined that such a contract did not offend against any prohibition of the Constitution.

Hence we may agree with the legal opinion referred to by Dr. Scharf, that there is "no constitutional inhibition," etc., provided it be understood that this applies to the government of the District of Columbia and the Federal Constitution only. This, of course, leaves the Supreme Court decision, which is cited in Dr. Scharf's paper, of very limited application and of no value whatever as a precedent in the States whose constitutions contain (as many of them do) express and sweeping prohibitions against the appropriation of public money for schools under so-called "sectarian" management.

As examples we quote: From the Constitution of South Carolina of 1875: "The property or credit of the State of South Carolina or of any county, city, town, township, school district or other subdivision of the said State, or any public money from whatever source derived, should not by gift, donation, loan, contract, appropriation or otherwise be used directly or indirectly in aid or maintenance of any college, school, hospital, orphan house or other institution, society or organization of whatever kind which is wholly or in part under the direction or control of any church or of any religious denomination, society or organization." And from that of New York, section 4, article 9, Amendment of Convention of 1894: "Neither the State nor any sub-division thereof shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used directly or indirectly in aid or maintenance other than for examination or inspection of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination or in which any denominational tenet or determination is taught." And again from the Constitution of Missouri, Article 11, Section 11: "Neither the General Assembly nor any county, city, town, township, school district or other municipal corporation shall ever make an appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever anything in aid of any religious creed, church or sectarian purpose or to help to support or sustain any private or public school, academy, seminary, college, university or other institution of

learning controlled by any religious creed, church or sectarian denomination whatever."

Similar prohibitions may be found in the constitutions of California, Colorado, Illinois, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, and perhaps other States.

So long as the prohibitions contained in these constitutions stand unrepealed, it is quite evident that the law-making power is prevented from making any appropriation of public money for education in schools under "sectarian" control, and the Supreme Court of the United States would be bound to uphold these restraints as surely as it upheld the freedom of the District of Columbia Commissioners to make the contract which they did with the Providence Hospital.

Here again, however, we must note the distinction, which is pretty well acknowledged, between the appropriation of public money by the State for educational purposes wholly and exclusively, and an appropriation for the care of the indigent sick or for maintenance of orphans or other dependents on the bounty of the State even in religious institutions. In the one case (i. e., of a school) "sectarian control" prevents the appropriation; in the other, it is no hindrance, even though religious as well as secular education is furnished to wards of the State. And this on the theory that such education is merely an incident to the maintenance and support of those helpless ones whom the State is bound, and has assumed, to provide for. The one suggestion in Dr. Scharf's paper which invites serious consideration is whether the State, having the right to contract with a State corporation, even though it be a religious institution, for the care of the sick, the orphans, or juvenile delinquents, has not by analogy the right to contract with a parochial school for the secular education of its children. In some of the States a per capita allowance is paid for the shelter, food, and clothing of each child committed to an asylum or reformatory, whether under Catholic or Protestant or Hebrew control, during the period of its stay in the institution. If now, in the interest of good citizenship, the State has made the secular education of the child compulsory on parents and guardians, why may not the State with equal justification pay for each child instructed in secular studies by capable teachers and according to a standard prescribed by the State, even though this be done in a school where religious instruction is superadded to the secular? The State will then pay no more than it would have to pay if the same children were educated at its expense in the "public schools." For the State to refuse, because it knows that such children will in any event be educated in the parochial schools at considerable saving to the State, would be to take a mean advantage of the con-

scientious scruples of Catholic parents. Of course we shall be met with the answer that the Constitutions forbids. Here is the crux of the whole case.

But we must close. The argument might be further developed thus: What is our remedy? 1. Why not a test case? Can not some fair-minded school board be found who will make such a contract? An injunction will then be asked for, and the question carried through the courts. This failing, then, 2. Alter the constitution so as to permit contracts for education. Our Catholic politicians will deprecate "bringing religion into politics," but the constitution was altered against us when we were helpless to prevent it; why not alter it back again so as to do us justice?

THE STORY OF DR. EDWARD PREUSS' CONVERSION.

[As Told by Himself.]

XIV.

In connection with these reflections he gave much study to the marks by which the true Church is distinguished from the sects.

According to Catholic teaching, the Church, like any other society or person, must be judged by its fruits. According to the Lutheran doctrine, on the other hand, by the "word and sacrament," that is to say, by its "causes."

Our Divine Lord undoubtedly approved the Catholic view, as clearly appears from Matth. vii, 16 and 20 and the parallel passages.

Among these fruits there must surely be reckoned moral purity and sanctity.

The Catholic Church can claim a veritable cloud of saints: men like St. Benedict, St. Columba, St. Augustine, the Apostle of England, St. Boniface, St. Bernard, St. Francis, whose immaculate purity of life is acknowledged by such modern Protestant historians as Neander, Rettberg, and Hase.

What a sorry figure the coryphaei of Lutheranism present when compared to these Catholic saints! Luther himself who, no matter how high one may estimate his genius and other qualities, must be admitted to have broken a solemn vow,*) and who inveighed against his opponents with such hatred and in language so rude and indecent, that the tenth part of his invectives would to-day suffice to forfeit one's reputation.†) Then there is Ulrich

*) 5 Mos. xxiii, 22-23.

†) If the reader will peruse 'Das Papsthum zu Rom vom Teufel gestiftet,' he will not find our judgment too severe.

von Hutten, as his unbiased Protestant biographer Meiners has portrayed him from the sources. Then Matthew Flacius, whom the American Lutherans of the strict observancy venerate as high authority, despite his notorious quarrelsomeness and his peculiar bibliographical "extravagances."

Among the eminent monarchs of the past our ex-Professor compared Louis IX., who became famous through his Catholic life, with Philip of Hesse, who lives in history as a staunch Lutheran. Louis according to the unanimous testimony of all his contemporaries never told a lie, much less committed a mortal sin; Philip got the sanction of his "reformed" confessor to live in bigamy.

Christ says: "A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit, neither can an evil tree bring forth good fruit." Is that not plain enough?

Add to this what may be properly called the religious fruits of Lutheranism as compared with Catholicism. The Catholic Church had inviolately preserved the fundamental Christian truths§) for fifteen hundred years; Protestantism grew into Rationalism and utter denial of God and all supernatural truth.

Even the Bible had been preserved by the Catholic Church, during a period extending over nearly two thousand years, complete, unadulterated, in its plain sense, ever commanding a position of the highest and most general respect and veneration; while advanced Protestantism, born of the Lutheran Reformation, had rejected one-half of the Holy Text and distorted and held up to ridicule the other half.

Politically, Catholicism had, in the days when it ruled the nations produced free constitutions,*) while Lutheranism is responsible for State religions, for monarchical absolutism and the radicalism of the Revolution.†)

Not only "sanctity," but also "unity" is considered by Catholics as a mark of the true Church. And here again our Professor found them to be in harmony with Holy Writ.

The Gospel of St. John contains in its seventeenth chapter the Savior's petition: "And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me. That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."‖)

---

‡) Matth. vii, 18.

§) The Holy Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, His real, bodily Resurrection, His Ascension into Heaven, the Last Judgment.

*) Cfr. the Magna charta libertatum, of 1215, the constitutions of the free cities in the German Empire and the episcopal cities of Italy. Centralization and the tyranny to which it gave rise, were no product of the Middle Ages.

†) Henry VIII., Charles I., Stuart, and Cromwell in England. In Germany: on the one hand: the electors and kings of the house of Hohenzollern; on the other, the Peasants' War and the Anabaptists of Muenster.

‖) John, xvii, 20, 21.

What the Son of God prays for, he obtains. Hence we may look at this petition in the light of a prophecy: They who will believe in me through the word of the Apostles, will all be one, as the Holy Trinity is one.

And the result of this unity will be that the world will believe in the divine mission of Jesus.

When was this prediction fulfilled? For fifteen hundred years, from St. Peter to Luther.

Since then dissension has taken the place of unity. Not only did the reformers and their satellites fight against Rome; they also fought amongst themselves. We remind the reader of the manner in which Luther, in 1529, ended the religious discussion with Zwingli and the Swiss preachers at Marburg; of the bitter feud between Unionism and Confessionalism, Rationalism and orthodoxy, which disrupted Protestantism in the nineteenth century.

They are *not* one—we may say—as Christ and the Father are one. And therefore the world no longer believes that Christ was sent by the Father.

Or is it not a palpable fact that the coexistence of four or five Christian churches in Europe has nourished religious indifference and finally led to atheism?

To sum up: Sanctity and unity are distinctive marks of the Catholic Church.

[*To be continued.*]

MINOR TOPICS.

The Legality of Rerating.—In view of the fact that application has been made by a dissatisfied member of the Catholic Knights of America in Kentucky for the appointment of a receiver to wind up the business of the order, because its supreme officers have rerated the members, the official *C. K. of A. Journal* devotes some space in its November number to the question of the legality of rerating. We quote for the benefit of the timid in other organizations:

Many decisions have been rendered in the courts of the several States upon this subject, notably, one in October, 1899, in the case of James A. Fullenwinder vs. The Supreme Council of the Royal League, 180 Ill., page 621, on appeal from the Appellate Court affirming decision of Circuit Court, Cook County. In this case Fullenwinder became a member of the Royal League in 1895, at age 39, and was required to pay one assessment each month at the rate of $2.62 for his insurance. The terms of the certificate were set out, in which it was expressly stated that he was bound

by the laws then existing or thereafter enacted; that the Supreme Council had a right by a three-fourth vote to change or alter laws. At a meeting of the Supreme Council in 1898 the laws were amended so that the rates were increased on the various ages of membership, and that plaintiff's rate was increased after only three years' membership. No fraud was charged in making the new laws, and all proper forms had been complied with, the only claim being that the charge was unreasonable and unjust, and a violation of plaintiff's contract.

The Court, Mr. Justice Phillips delivering the opinion, said: "The power to enact by-laws for the government of the corporate body is an incident to the existence of the body corporate, and is inherent in it. The power to make such changes as may be deemed advisable is a continuous one. When the contract contains an express provision reserving the right to amend or change by-laws, it can not be doubted that the society has the right to do so, and where, in a certificate of membership, it is provided that members shall be bound by the rules and regulations now governing the Council and fund, or that may thereafter be enacted for such government, and these conditions are assented to and the member accepts the certificate under the conditions provided therein, it is a sufficient reservation of the right of the society to amend or change its by-laws. Dwinger v. Geary, 113 Ind. 106; Supreme Lodge v. Knight, 117 Ind. 489; Steher v. San Francisco W. F. Society, 82 Cal. 557; Niblack on Benefit Soc. (2d ed.), Secs. 24-28; Bacon on Benefit Societies (2d ed.), Sec. 185; 1 Joyce on Insurance, Secs. 188, 189; Poultney v. Bachman, 31 Hun. 49; Fugure v. Mutual Soc. 46 Vt. 362; Supreme Commandery v. Ainsworth, 71 Ala. 449. It is apparent that the new by-law was adopted in the manner provided for in the law of the society, and was not an unreasonable enactment. It was enacted under a right to amend the by-laws reserved expressly in the contract, and hence it can not be claimed that it in any manner impaired any vested right. The contract required compliance with any by-laws that might thereafter be enacted, and the certificate being accepted with such a clause therein, there is no vested right of having the contract in the certificate remain unchanged, because the recognition of the power to make new by-laws is necessarily a recognition of the right to repeal or amend those theretofore made. Whilst courts strongly disfavor any alteration or change in an insurance contract without the assent of the insured, yet where the contract thus reserves to the corporation the right from time to time to amend its rules or by-laws, and binds the assured to compliance with such rules or by-laws, and such provision is expressly assented to in writing by the assured, it can not be said that it would be an extraordinary power to make such change, and such a contract would not meet with disfavor from the courts. Becker v. Farmers' Mut. Ins. Co., 11 Ins., L. J. 595; Hobbs v. Iowa Mut. Ben. Ass'n. 20 id. 434; Supreme Commandery v. Ainsworth, 71 Ala. 449.

"We are of the opinion there was power in the society to change the by-laws as provided, and that the defendant accepted his certificate with full knowledge of the reservation of such power in

the society, and assented thereto. The judgment of the Appellate Court is affirmed, the decree of the Circuit Court is affirmed."—

Meanwhile the C. K. of A. managers have won their case in Kentucky. It will be appealed, but in view of the precedents, there can hardly be any doubt that they will win out.

The Uncleverness of "Clever Hans."—"Clever Hans," a stallion exhibited by a gentleman named von Osten recently at Berlin, has deceived numerous people, and articles about him have filled many a column in the foreign and American papers. Even the *Scientific American* was led to publish a paper about him, calculated to make its readers believe that "Hans" is an intelligent animal, capable of of making arithmetical calculations and even of ratiocination. This led our friend and valued contributor Rev. Prof. H. Muckermann, S. J., of Prairie du Chien, Wis., to send the *Scientific American* a brief paper under the above caption. It was published in that journal on Nov. 12th, and we gladly comply with Fr. Muckermann's request to reproduce its substance among the "Minor Topics" of THE REVIEW:

I believe that it will be of interest to your readers to hear of a few facts which may serve to throw some light on the other side of the question. These facts are taken from the weekly edition of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* (No. 36, September 8th, 1904):

1. A watch was presented to "clever Hans." Without condescending to look at it, he immediately gave the correct answer by stamping eleven times—it happened to be 11 o'clock. I repeat, the animal did not even glance at the watch.

2. Mr. X, who was among the spectators, wrote an example of arithmetic on a slip of paper in such a way that no one present, not even the owner of the horse, knew the figures of the problem. The paper was then presented to the horse with the request to paw the solution. The animal started pawing *ad infinitum*. Mr. X exclaimed: "It's all wrong; the horse has passed the number by far." Whereupon the owner replied in an angry tone: "Why, of course; you must tell when the required number has been reached, or else you might as well ask the horse to sit down in a cab and take a ride!" There followed an excited scene, and "clever Hans" was led back to his stable.

3. On a certain wall near by, fourteen boys were sitting in two rows. Hans was asked by Mr. Schillings, how many boys were sitting on the wall. Without looking in the direction of the wall and counting, Hans pawed fourteen times.

4 Another time, a captain of the army gave Hans a very simple problem in addition, but made sure that his owner could not influence the horse. Hans failed completely. Then the owner got hold of him, and lo! Hans solved the problem correctly.

It is curious to note, moreover, that Hans must always paw the answers to the questions put to him. Take the following case. A picture is shown to Hans, representing one of the people before him. All present form a row and Hans is requested to point out the person represented. Now, why does Hans not simply walk up to the person in question? Why must he paw the answer?

Again, is it not strange that during the calculations von Osten must feed the horse with carrots, if he would have him work. If

Hans be intelligent, why should the honor of being admired by thousands of people and of being far above the common level of horses not, occasionally at least, be sufficient inducement for Hans to display his cleverness? Certainly, children of from twelve to fourteen years—and Hans is declared by his owner to have attained to the same degree of education as these—readily act from motives of ambition.

Besides, although Hans seems to have given correct answers in the absence of his owner, it is by no means certain that his owner is the only person who had a hand in, or at least is privy to, Hans' training. Perhaps Mr. Schillings could furnish us with an explanation.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the Sixth International Congress of Zoologists, held at Bern on Aug. 15th to 19th, was requested by Mr. Schillings to investigate the matter. A hearty laugh was the answer of the learned men. They did not even call upon Dr. Heck and Prof. Matschie, who had been recommended by Mr. Schillings to report on the "reasoning horse," and some of them were impolite enough to relegate the circular submitted to them to the waste-basket.

Such are some of the facts, which rather seem to justify those who "skeptically assert that his (the horse's) intelligence is simply the result of ingeniously concealed trickery on the part of his trainers."

Some Questions Which Socialists Refused to Answer.—Rev. Wm. S. Kress, of the Cleveland Apostolate, last May addressed a registered communication to the National Socialist Convention at Chicago, which was duly received, as per receipt, but entirely ignored. It was as follows:

"Mr. Charles Dobbs, Secretary National Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago. Dear Sir: The writer is not a Socialist, nor is he friendly to the Socialist cause: but as an antagonist he wants to fight fair. I have been told time and again that what I and others represented as Socialism was not real Socialism at all; hence I would respectfully ask that the national convention of your party give an authoritative affirmative or denial to the following propositions:

"1. In proposing to 'transform the means of production and distribution into collective ownership by the entire people,' do you propose to compensate the present holders of active capital to the full extent of the confiscation? If so, how do you propose that it shall be done?

"2. Is it the sense of your convention that labor checks, or whatever your medium of exchange may be, shall be for use by the earner alone, or be transferable at will?

"3. It is charged by many that Socialism aims to disrupt the family and make love the only bond of union between husband and wife. One gets such a notion from reading Marx, Engels, Bebel, Owen, Morris, Hyndman, Bax, Carpenter, Noyes, Kerr, Herron, *Appeal to Reason* (Feb. 21st, 1903), etc. Will not your convention go on record as repudiating all such teaching?

"4. When you affirm and reaffirm adherence to the principles of

international Socialism, do the principles include the materialistic concept of history*) and economic determinism ?†)

"5. Do you agree with the proposition said by official reports to have won the approval of the recent Dresden convention, that 'no religious instruction of any kind shall be given to children under the age of sixteen'?

"6. Do you believe in absolute democracy, that the vote of the majority shall be supreme in all things, even to the extent of overriding God's revealed will?

"I make bold to obtrude this communication upon your convention with the twofold hope of gaining more light on Socialistic aims and of securing, if possible, an authoritative declaration against radical Socialism. Many others besides myself will be interested in the answers your convention may give to the above questions.—Yours respectfully, (Rev.) WM. S. KRESS."

No answer was ever given, officially or privately.

The "Catholic University of America" Wants More Funds.—Cardinal Gibbons, in a circular issued to the hierarchy of the United States under date of Oct. 22nd, but not published until a week or two ago, freely admits that even "with the utmost economy as now practiced in every department, the income [of the "Catholic University of America"] is not sufficient for the necessary expenses."

His Eminence who, as Chancellor and President of the Board of Trustees, is primarily responsible for the conduct of the University, gives no explanation with regard to the Waggaman failure and how it was possible for so large a portion of the University's general endowment to become exposed to the danger of absolute loss.

But he appeals to the hierarchy, and through them to the clergy and our good people, to make up the losses and secure the University by contributing generously to this year's collection, for which the managers of the institution have not this time, it seems, succeeded in getting the blessing or commendation of the Holy Father.

We apprehend that a great many who last year gave liberally, will this time refuse to contribute until they are sure there will not be another Waggaman failure and that the University, rueing the errors of its past, will develop into a truly Catholic institution as intended by its august founder.

The Need of a Watchful Catholic Press and an Active Federation of Catholic Societies is shown in the case of the hundred Filipino boys brought over to be educated at the government's expense, to prepare them for positions of leadership in the islands. All these boys are Catholics, yet all of them were sent to non-sectarian colleges, so-called, many of which are as thoroughly Protestant as Notre Dame and Georgetown are Catholic, and all of which are anti-Catholic at least in their history classes. The press and the

---

*) According to Socialistic ideas, man is of the earth earthly, first and last,—a mere material being, without soul or free will, and incapable of intelligent, independent action.

†) "Economic determinism" means to the Socialist that a man's morals, his religion, his form of government, etc., are purely the result of his environment and more especially of his economic status. Most other men hold that his will, rather than a man's pocketbook, is responsible for his virtues and vices, and they consider mind and soul more potent than matter to the shaping of his present and future destiny.

Federation made a vigorous protest, and now fifteen of the hundred have been sent to Notre Dame This is a small "victory," it is true; but by further agitation perhaps full justice can be obtained for these Catholic boys from an unwilling if smooth-tongued government. "It must never be forgotten," justly observes our Canadian contemporary, the *Casket* (lii, 45), from which the above lines are taken, "that to the average American anything that is not Catholic is non-sectarian. Henry Cabot Lodge said in the Senate last winter that New Mexico must not become a State until it had become 'American in religion.' There is no such thing as an 'American religion,' but what Senator Lodge meant is quite clear. The people of New Mexico must cease to be Catholics before receiving statehood."

——In a Rome correspondence of the San Francisco *Leader* (Nov. 12th), which contained an exaggerated panegyric of Archbishop Christie of Oregon City, it was stated, among other things, that he had concentrated a nucleus of ecclesiastical students in his archiepiscopal seminary at Mount Angel and had prevailed upon the Benedictines to open a school for the higher education of boys. Rev. L. Verhaag, who has been a priest of the Archdiocese of Oregon City since 1872, in his own name and that of several of his confratres, begs us to state that these assertions are not true. "The truth is that the seminary belongs to the Benedictines, was entirely built by them from donations and other sources, and that the Archdiocese has not contributed one cent towards its erection." With regard to the second point, "The fact is that already under Archbishop Seghers, of saintly memory, who received the Benedictines in Oregon, these Fathers had started a school for the purpose indicated in the *Leader's* article." Father Verhaag says he asks THE REVIEW to make this correction, because the *Leader* refused it, and THE REVIEW, circulating in Oregon, as it does all over the country, may bring it to the notice of some of those who may have been misled by the *Leader's* correspondent.

——Writing in Dr. Kausen's excellent weekly review, the *Allgemeine Rundschau* of Munich (i, 33), on the subject of hagiography and the veneration of Saints, Rector Doergens of Ondenval-Weismes says: "The lives of the saints hitherto published are most of them open to the objection that they do not distinguish sharply enough between history and legend. The authors excuse themselves with the statement that the reason why they reproduce unauthenticated legends is because they aim at edification, and declare, if many of them can not stand before a sober criticism, this will not diminish the edification they are apt to inspire in the reader. They forget that true edification can best be obtained by describing the true deeds of the saints, never by rehashing tales which bear the earmarks of improbability and invention. 'Protestants and infidels,' says Bishop Egger, 'hold the Church responsible for these things and are confirmed in their own opinions by the thought that the truth can not possibly be hidden behind such silly trash.'"

——The *Church Progress* of this city is gleefully throwing bouquets at itself as "the only paper, religious or secular, in the State of Missouri which made a persistent fight against the free text book amendment," and says that "two years ago it was the only paper which made a similar fight on the compulsory educational law, which was also defeated." (*Church Progress*, xxvii, 32, *et passim.*)

The *Church Progress* did good work in both these battles. But it was not by any means the only knight in the arena. The *Western Watchman* also fought the free text book amendment. Likewise the *Amerika*, which for weeks hammered away at the obnoxious object nearly every day. The *Herold des Glaubens* too did its share valiantly, not to speak of at least half a dozen newspapers in the interior of the State, and—last not least—our humble REVIEW. The same is true of the fight waged some years ago against compulsory education. *Suum cuique*, dear *Progress;* you are not the only pebble on the beach!

——An entertaining discussion has gone on recently in the columns of the London *Daily News* over the quaint phrase in an advertisement, "I took my wrong umbrella." The *News* itself calls the expression "an exquisite Irishism, the subtle beauty of which requires some pointing out." A celebrated English jurist, we believe, once wrote for the diversion of his friends a weighty opinion on the law of umbrellas as it existed in the popular mind. There was no such thing as ownership of an umbrella, he held. A person might retain exclusive possession of one while using it, as during a rain-storm, but as soon as it passed out of his hand, it became a part of the world's stock of umbrellas and, as such, like a gallon of air, was ready for the use of whoever needed it.

——Speaking of church music, the Chicago *Chronicle*, a secular daily, says (ed. of Nov. 13th): "Perhaps the greatest fault of most anthem-singing is that it is undevotional. Instead of expressing feelings of solemnity, reverence, and worship, it is designed to glorify the singers, and to do this by all sorts of bizarre effects, by a succession of brilliant chords and piercing yells, without any sweetness or sentiment. A choir given to this kind of singing may sing some people away from God a great deal faster than the preacher can preach them back again."

Why, then, does the *Chronicle* impugn Pope Pius X.'s proposed reform of church music, which aims at abolishing precisely such abuses as its own editorial condemns?

——Some one calls attention to Secretary Hay's funny allusion, in one of his campaign speeches, to the military experience of the poet Horace? He told us that many great men, beside the hero of San Juan, have been soldiers; even Horace could say: "militavi non sine gloria." But when the poet wrote these words, he was not thinking of the time when he was "deducted into extreme peril, Brutus being leader of the militia"—as the school-girl translates it. If Mr. Hay had verified his quotation—or had his literary amanuensis do it—he would have seen that Horace is referring to the service of Venus, not of Mars; and his battles were those of the maidens against the youths (Odes III, 26: "Vixi puellis nuper idoneus")—surely a strange collocation for a Rough Rider!

——F. de Méley publishes in the tenth volume of the 'Monuments et Mémoires publiés par l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres' at Paris, under the title "Vases de Cana," a learned enquiry into the history of the various existing vases claimed to be the water-pots of stone used at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, which is related in the second chapter of the Gospel of St. John. Thus there is one at Reichenau, one at Hildesheim, one at Beauvais, another at Cologne, two at Jerusalem, one at Constantinople, etc. *M.* de Méley gives photographs of twenty-two of them, and it is interesting to learn how the six traditionary water-pots have finally developed into more than thirty costly vases. These are mostly traceable to the time of the Crusades.

——Besides the excellent social courses for men, upon which we have lately commented, the German Catholics are now inaugurating popular courses in social science for women and girls. Lectures are to be held this winter in various cities of the Empire with the purpose of instructing Catholic women in the burning social questions of the day, and especially their own duties in regard to the same. The courses will be given under the auspices of the Catholic Women's Union and with the approval of His Eminence Cardinal Fischer, Archbishop of Cologne. The headquarters of the Union are in Cologne, Georgstrasse No. 7.

——The Catholic women of Germany have formed a "Catholic Womans' Union," which recently held its first general congress at Frankfort on the Main. It is not a development of "feminism" in the French sense, but an effort to instruct the Catholic women of the Fatherland in the questions which particularly interest their sex and to wake among them the social spirit, so that they may be enabled to contribute, within their own proper circle of activity, their mite towards the solution of the great social questions.

——In the highly esteemed *Courrier de Bruxelles* of Nov. 8th we find one of those panegyrics of *M.* Ferdinand Brunetière, the learned Parisian editor and academician, which periodically infest the French newspapers of Europe and frequently find an echo in the American Catholic press. We have perused it with profound attention, but are still waiting for an answer to our question: Is Brunetière a practical Catholic?

——Rev. S. F. Smith, S. J., in the October *Month*, traces out the history of the Athanasian Creed, with this upshot: The author of the Creed is not known, but it certainly was not St. Athanasius. From external evidence, the Creed seems to come from an age previous to Charlemagne's time, and internal evidence leads us to suppose that this profession of faith is the production of the fifth century or thereabouts.

——Rev. Prof. Charles Becker, of St. Francis, Wis., begs us to take notice in THE REVIEW, for the information of his many friends who are readers of this journal, of the death, on Nov. 21st, of his brother August Becker, teacher and choir director in Witten, Westphalia. *R. I. P.*